



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,562	08/15/2003	William F. Jones	2003P11239US	6621
7590 Siemens Corporation Intellectual Property Department 170 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830				
01/22/2009				
EXAMINER				
CARTAGENA, MELVIN A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3754				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/22/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/644,562

Applicant(s)

JONES ET AL.

Examiner

MELVIN A. CARTAGENA

Art Unit

3754

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-14 and 16-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-14 and 16-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

3DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 9-11, 14 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,974,752 to Sirek in view of US 5,979,794 to DeFillipi et al.

Sirek shows a housing 12, heaters 37 and 38 coupled to the housing, a removable hollow tube 19 coupled to the housing at an orifice 17, an ejector device, see Fig. 5, a channel 18, an electrical switch and temperature control 56, indicating lights 54 and 55, a trigger 23, a ram piston 29 and a standard power plug 27.

Sirek shows all claimed features as discussed above except for an air driven piston and a mixer for mixing two components. DeFillipi shows a dispenser for hot adhesive actuated by a pneumatic piston and cylinder 60 and a mixing element 38 to mix two components. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of Sirek to dispense two mixed temperature conditioned products using a pneumatic driven piston to increase the point of application control over the flow of the adhesive as taught by DeFillipi.

With respect to using the device to dispense support components in a generator, it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to

be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

3. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,974,752 to Sirek as modify by US 5,979,794 to DeFillipi et al. as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of US 5,188,259 to Petit.

The Sirek-DeFillipi combination show all claimed features as discussed above except for an electrical driven piston instead of a mechanical driven piston. Petit shows hot adhesive dispenser using an electrically driven piston, see Fig. 3. Petit shows that an electrically and pneumatic driven drives are equivalent structures known in the art. Therefore, because these two Drives were art recognized equivalents at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to substitute a mechanical drive for an electrical drive.

4. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,974,752 to Sirek as modify by US 5,979,794 to DeFillipi et al. as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of US 4,889,440 to Shano.

The Sirek-DeFillipi combination show all claimed features as discussed above but is silent about the indicating lights 54 and 55 being Diodes. Shano shows a hot adhesive dispenser using indicating LED. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the light indicators of the device of the Sirek-DeFillipi combination for LED to increase the reliability of the light indicators as taught by Shano.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed October 23, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the system is directed to creating blocks between adjacent stator coils, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MELVIN A. CARTAGENA whose telephone number is (571)272-4924. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30AM to 7:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin P. Shaver can be reached on (571) 272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. A. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 3754

/Kevin P. Shaver/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3754